REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-34 are pending. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18-21, 26-31 and 34have been amended to address the Examiner's objections. Claims 5, 8, 14, 17 and 33 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3, 6-12 and 15-30 and 32-34 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Schneck, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The present invention is directed to a computer readable medium comprising a program for interesting and retaining at least one qualified purchaser or licensee of a patent.

The program has machine readable program code for permitting a purchaser to attain access to varying levels of information disclosure relating to a patent or trade secret in the computer readable storage medium based on levels of interest of the purchaser. The claims have been amended to include the language, "with the proviso that the information is not the product itself. The machine readable program code protects the levels of information disclosure. Each additional level of information disclosure relating to a patent ~~or trade secret~~ is more confidential and is more secure than the preceding level of disclosure.

No patent: Schneck, et al. does not anticipate the claims under 35 USC 102(b) because the data in Schneck, et al. is not about protecting information relating to a patent. Digital music protected in Schneck, et al. is not "information relating to a patent." Music is copyrighted. This is an important distinction. There is no machine readable program code in Schneck, et al. for permitting a

buyer and seller to exchange information and make requests relative to information relating to a patent. Schneck is related to the download of the product itself.

The levels of disclosure in the present invention are described in the specification as being a description of patents, sales presentations focusing on the benefits (but not necessarily the specifics) of the technology, with detailed text, pictures, samples or other items normally associated with an initial sales presentation. (page 13, lines 1-8), and information regarding ability to acquire and exploit technology (Fig. 2). At the end of the process, the purchaser may obtain a full disclosure of the technology (information relating to the patent) (page 13) and enter into a contract relative to the patent. These levels of disclosure are not even mentioned in Schneck, et al.

The intellectual property in Schneck et al. must be taken in the context of which it is recited. A careful reading of column 34, lines 29-41 reveals that the term, "intellectual property" as it is used in Schneck, et al. is used loosely to refer to the physical **data or product and not actually information relating to a patent**. Schneck, et al. describes how it can help intellectual property (copyright) owners of digital data …

> "While the present invention may be used to protect intellectual property by controlling access to that property, the mechanisms discussed herein are technical in nature and are independent of any form of legal protection—a purely technological approach has been presented to controlling access to data. Indeed, the invention offers the intellectual property owner the opportunity to restrict access and use of his or her data beyond the protections that may be available in law."

Although Scneck, et al. states that its protections may be applied to trade secrets, it can be understood by the description that the information is the product itself and not information relating to the product.

The important distinction here is the difference between protecting the product, music, and protecting information disclosure relating to a patent or trade secret. Therefore, Schneck, et al. does not anticipate the present claims under 35 USC 102(b).

Claims 4, 13, and 31 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U S patent No. 5,933,498 to Schneck, et al. in view of U S Patent No. 5,991,876 to Johnson et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As stated above, Scheck, et al. is not directed to protection of information disclosure relating to a patent. Johnson et al. does not make up for this deficiency because Johnson et al. also does not protect information disclosure relating to a patent. Further, there is no motivation provided in either reference for their combination.

It is submitted that the present invention is not anticipated by Schneck, et al. or obvious over Schneck et al. in view of Johnson, et al. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 16, 2006

Caroline Nash, Reg. No. 36, 329
Nash & Titus, LLC, Customer No. 30951
21402 Unison Road
Middleburg, VA 20117
(540) 554-4551